I hereby certify that this correspondence is being filed by courier delivery addressed to the Examiner on behalf of the Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks, the courier stripment for next day delivery sent on the

date indicated below.

Paper No.

PATENT

File: Graff-P2-98

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Inventor GRAFF, Richard A.

Serial No. 09/134,453

Filed 14 August 1998

For COMPUTERS MAKING FINANCIAL ANALYSIS

OUTPUT HAVING PROPERTY VALUATIONS

Group Art Unit 2761

Examiner N. Rosen

Honorable Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks Washington, D.C. 20231

TRANSMITTAL LETTER

SIR:

Transmitted herewith for filing in the above-identified patent application are the following:

- Response to Notification of Non-Compliance; and 1.
- 2. Appeal Brief (in triplicate).

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees associated with the above-identified patent application or credit any overcharges to Deposit Account No. 50-0235.

Please direct all correspondence to the undersigned at the address given

below.

Respectfully submitted,

Péter K. Trzyne

(Reg. No. 32,601)

P.O. Box 7131 Chicago, IL 60680-7131 (312) 240-0824

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being filed by courier delivery addressed the Examiner on behalf of the Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks, the Courier shipment for next day delivery

sent on the date indicate

Signed

PATENT

Paper No.

File: Graff-P2-98

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Inventor

GRAFF, Richard A.

Serial No.

90/134,453

Filed

14 August 1998

For

COMPUTERS MAKING FINANCIAL ANALYSIS

OUTPUT HAVING PROPERTY VALUATIONS

Group Art Unit

2761

Examiner

N. Rosen

Honorable Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks Washington, D.C. 20231

RESPONSE TO NOTIFICATION OF NON-COMPLIANCE

SIR:

In response to the Office Action mailed 21 October 2002, an objection has been raised to the brief. The Examiner contends that the brief fails to provide a concise statement of the issues pursuant to 35 C.F.R. Sec. 1.1929(c)(6), in view MPEP 1206.

In response, the objection is respectfully traversed.

It is improper to object to a brief based on the MPEP where the brief as originally filed met all requirements of the CFR. The only requirement of this section of the Federal Regulations is "a concise statement of issues presented for review." A concise statement of issues presented for review was provided in the brief at pages 62-71.

The brief was rejected based solely on the MPEP, and this is improper as a

matter of law. The MPEP is an examination procedure manual of the Patent Office, not Federal law.

Nonetheless, to avoid any further delay, the issues previously presented have been presented again posed in question form, with 3 more copies of the 288 page brief being provided herewith.

The approach of using a question form is pursuant to a brief conversation with the always-helpful Examiner Rosen who, despite the hard fought nature of the instant case, is most respected for his thorough, competent, and professional approach.

The brief complies with, and satisfies, all requirements of Federal law and is believed to be in condition for consideration by the Board. Allowance, and favorable action is requested.

If the prosecution of this case can be in any way advanced by a further telephone discussion, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned at (312) 240-0824.

Respectfully submitted,

Peter K. Trzyna

(Reg. No. 32,601)

P.O. Box 7131 Chicago, Illinois 60680-7131

Mbr 28,2002

(312) 240-0824